REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application, as amended, is respectfully requested. Claims 1-60 are currently pending.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(a)

Claims 1-40

Examiner rejected claims 1-40 as being anticipated by US Patent No, 6,477,543 by Huang. Applicant respectfully submits that Huang does not disclose each and every element of the invention as claimed in claims 1-40.

Independent claims 1, 11, 21, and 31, as amended, include the limitation, or a limitation similar thereto, of:

> sending, to the server, filter information;
> filtering data based on the filter information; and
> receiving, from the server, the filtered data or a subset of the filtered data that has changed since the previous synchronization operation to update the second database.

In contrast, Huang discloses transformation including code for filtering, transforming, and changing data so that the data can be used and processed in different computing devices. (Huang, col. 11, lines 34-38). Accordingly, Huang discloses filtering out all images from a web page so that the page can be shown on a screen without taking up too much memory. (Huang, col. 11, lines 38-44). Huang does not teach or suggest receiving, from the server, one of the filtered data or a subset of the filtered data that has changed since the previous synchronization operation to update the second database, as claimed.

Since Huang does not teach each and every limitation of claims 1, 11, 21 and 31, it cannot anticipate claims 1, 11, 21 and 31. Claims 2-10, 12-20, 22-30 and 32-40 depend on one of claims 1, 11, 21 and 31 and include each and every limitation of claims 1, 11, 21 and 31. Accordingly, Huang does not anticipate claims 2-10, 12-20, 22-30 and 32-40 as well. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of the claims 1-40 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) over the reference.

Claims 41, 43-46, 48-51, 53-56, and 58-60

Examiner rejected claims 41, 43-46, 48-51, 53-56, and 58-60 as being anticipated by Huang. Applicant respectfully submits that Huang does not disclose each and every element of the invention as claimed in claims 41, 43-46, 48-51, 53-56, and 58-60.

Independent claims 41, 46, 51, and 56, include the limitation, or a limitation similar thereto, of:

> processing the first filter and second filter information to select active filters; storing the processed filter information to serve as the second filter information for a next synchronization operation. . .

In contrast, Huang discloses merely that that during synchronization of two databases, the update direction for a data item can be specified. (Huang, col. 13, lines 52-55). Accordingly, for instance, it may be determined that a data item in one database (e.g. handheld) overrides the corresponding data item in another database. (Huang, col. 13, lines 55-59). Huang does not teach or suggest storing the processed filter information to serve as the second filter information for a next synchronization operation, as claimed.

Since Huang does not teach each and every limitation of claims 41, 46, 51, and 56, it cannot anticipate claims 41, 46, 51, and 56. Claims 43-45, 48-50, 53-55, and 58-60 depend on one of claims 41, 46, 51, and 56and include each and every limitation of claims 41, 46, 51, and

56. Accordingly, Huang does not anticipate claims 43-45, 48-50, 53-55, and 58-60 as well.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of the claims 41, 43-46, 48-51, 53-56, and 58-60 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) over the reference.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 42, 47, 52 and 57

Examiner rejected claims 42, 47, 52 and 57 as being unpatentable over Huang in view of US Patent No, 6,564,263 by Bergman et al. Applicant respectfully submits that this combination does not teach each and every element of these claims. As discussed above, Huang does not teach or suggest storing the processed filter information to serve as the second filter information for a next synchronization operation, and Bergman does not supply this missing element.

Indeed, Bergman merely discloses a description scheme for describing streams or aggregations of multimedia objects. Bergman does not teach storing the processed filter information to serve as the second filter information for a next synchronization operation as claimed.

Since neither Huang nor Bergman teaches writing the cryptogram on to the card after the user has taken possession of the card as claimed in independent claims 41, 46, 51, and 56, the combination cannot be interpreted to render obvious Applicant's invention as claimed in associated claims 42, 47, 52 and 57. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection over this combination.

SUMMARY

Applicant respectfully submits that in view of the amendments and discussion set forth herein, the applicable rejections have been overcome. Accordingly, the present and amended claims should be found to be in condition for allowance.

If a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact John P. Ward at (408) 720-8300.

If there are any additional charges/credits, please charge/credit our deposit account no. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: May 4, 2005

John P. Ward
Reg. No. 40,216

Customer No. 08791
12400 Wilshire Blvd.
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025
(408) 720-8300